

**REMARKS**

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reevaluation and further processing of the application is requested. Prior to this response, Claims 1-21 were cancelled and Claims 22-42 were pending in the application. By amendment herein, Claims 22, 23, 29, 31 have been amended, Claims 43-53 have been added and Claims 24-28 and 36-42 have been cancelled.

The Examiner rejected Claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,890,175 to Wong (“Wong”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. (“Bezos”). The amended and new claims are patentably distinguished from Wong and Bezos.

Wong describes a system for creating an electronic storefront through which an existing, presumably “bricks-and-mortar”, merchant can sell its own products and involves only two parties, the storefront creator/operator and the merchant. Wong thus allows an existing merchant to easily create an electronic storefront and sell its products electronically.

Bezos describes a system for adding an existing merchant as an “affiliate” to a pre-existing electronic storefront. Again, the Bezos system is a two-party system consisting of the storefront operator (who also sells its own products through its electronic storefront) and the affiliate. Bezos differs from Wong in that the affiliate is not provided an identifiable storefront of its own, but rather its products are accessed and sold through the pre-existing storefront.

The Applicant herein amends the claims and provides new claims to more clearly point out the three-party system described by the Applicant in the specification. The problems solved by the claimed systems and methods are related to how to efficiently provide an electronic storefront for a party, in which the electronic storefront sells products not provided by that party. Neither Wong nor Bezos teach or suggest such a three-party system as claimed as each party in Bezos and Wong either manages an electronic storefront and/or distributes products.

For example, in claim 22 the distinct parties are described as a host, product distributors, and a store owner. As described in the specification, each party has different responsibilities and the relationships between the parties are significantly different from those described in Wong and Bezos. The further dependent claims from claim 22 describe additional differences that are patentably distinguishable from the two-party systems described by Wong and Bezos. As the Examiner will see, because each party has different responsibilities, there is significant additional

complexity of interactions between the parties in three-party systems as described that do not occur in the two-party systems of Wong and Bezos.

The other claim sets now pending in the application similarly focus of different aspects of the systems described in the specification that are not shown and are not suggested in Bezos and Wong.

Conclusion

As a result of this amendment, Claims 22, 23, 29-35 and 43-53 remain pending in this application. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

10/13/06  
Date



  
George C. Lewis, Reg. No. 53,214  
Attorney for Applicant  
Greenberg Traurig LLP  
1200 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 2400  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 572-6500  
Fax: (303) 572-6540

and

Bruce T. Neel, Reg. No. 37,406  
Attorney for Applicant  
Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
2375 East Camelback Road, Suite 700  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
Tel: (602) 445-8000  
Fax: (602) 445-8100